

TRANSCRIPT PREPARED BY THE CLERK OF THE LEGISLATURE  
Transcriber's Office

March 13, 2000 LB 1107

growth in valuation. And what he shows there for each fiscal year is...well, in the first column, current yield as a percent of need, and you can see in '98-99 property taxes provided about 50.9 percent, then it went down to 48.1 and so on. If you capped that percentage at 45 percent, the percentages are shown in the next column, which would be the third one from the left, and the dollar amounts required at the state level would be shown in the fourth column. And you can see that in 2000-2001 a 45 percent cap would require about \$13 million of additional state aid to school systems. The next pair of columns detail the 47 percent figure, and the final two columns detail the 46 percent, which is the one we're discussing right now. And you can see, with the 46 percent number, that there wouldn't be any fiscal impact until fiscal year 2002-2003, and at that stage it would be \$462,000. I support this amendment and am going to support the bill. I did want to make a couple of comments on what Senator Chambers just commented on. First, he mentioned that the efforts of my amendment or the effort of my amendment was simply to delay the fiscal impact, and he's absolutely right. That's...I...I endorse the concept in this bill, but the fiscal impact, I think, is...we're better to take a more cautious approach and enter it in steps. He also mentioned that it was part of a bigger package, and I would agree with him there. I think that the type of property tax relief offered by this sort of a bill is quite comparable to that offered by the Governor's proposals. Finally, he did mention that he felt this was a program to benefit rural districts. I guess I would argue with him there. It seems to me that this will impact property taxpayers, whether they are rural or urban. And in fact, I haven't calculated the percentage, but probably there is a significant percentage of the benefit, if you will, to property taxpayers going to urban districts as compared to rural districts. It really does not, at least in my view, discriminate against urban property taxpayers in favor of rural. So, with that, with those comments, I'll just again indicate that I support the amendment and...

SENATOR CUDABACK: One minute.

SENATOR RAIKES: ...and will support the bill. Thank you.

SENATOR CUDABACK: Thank you, Senator Raikes. Senator Kremer,